

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXX No. 10

September 4, 2018

193 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Ledyard v. WMS Gaming, Inc., 330 C 75	3
<i>Personal property taxes; attorney's fees; final judgment; appellate jurisdiction; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court lacked subject matter jurisdiction over defendant's appeal from trial court's decision to grant plaintiff town's motion for summary judgment as to liability only; claim that Appellate Court improperly dismissed appeal by relying on footnote in Paranteau v. DeVita (208 Conn. 515); whether Appellate Court improperly failed to apply bright line rule from Paranteau that judgment on merits is final for purposes of appeal even though amount of attorney's fees had not yet been determined.</i>	
State v. Harris, 330 C 91	19
<i>Felony murder; robbery first degree; conspiracy to commit robbery first degree; eyewitness identifications; motion to suppress; out-of-court identification of defendant by eyewitness to crimes at arraignment on unrelated charges; claim that trial court violated defendant's due process rights under federal constitution by denying his motion to suppress eyewitness' out-of-court and in-court identifications of him because out-of-court identification was product of unnecessarily suggestive procedure and neither identification was reliable; claim that, even if defendant's federal constitutional rights were not violated, admission of those identifications violated defendant's due process rights under state constitution; whether defendant was entitled to suppression of out-of-court and in-court identifications under federal constitution; whether identification procedure was unnecessarily suggestive; whether identification of defendant at arraignment proceeding was nevertheless reliable under totality of circumstances; modification of framework for determining reliability of identifications set forth in Neil v. Biggers (409 U.S. 188) to conform to recent developments in social science and law, as matter of state constitutional law; endorsement of factors that this court identified as matter of state evidentiary law in State v. Guilbert (306 Conn. 218) for determining reliability of identifications; adoption of burden shifting framework that New Jersey Supreme Court articulated in State v. Henderson (208 N.J. 208) for purposes of allocating burden of proof with respect to admissibility of identification that is product of unnecessarily suggestive identification procedure; claim that, if trial court had applied standard that this court adopted for purposes of state constitution in present case, it would have concluded that identification should be excluded as insufficiently unreliable.</i>	
State v. Liebguth (Order), 330 C 901	69
Volume 330 Cumulative Table of Cases	71

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Chance v. Commissioner of Correction, 184 CA 524	70A
<i>Habeas corpus; whether habeas court abused its discretion in denying petition for certification to appeal; whether habeas court improperly determined that trial counsel did not render ineffective assistance by failing to present to trial court jury instructions that were consistent with State v. Salamon (287 Conn. 509); whether habeas court improperly determined that trial counsel did not render ineffective assistance by failing to file motion to suppress incriminating statements made by petitioner to police.</i>	

(continued on next page)

- Diaz v. Dept. of Social Services, 184 CA 538. 84A
Workers' compensation; whether Compensation Review Board properly affirmed denial and dismissal by Workers' Compensation Commissioner of plaintiff's claim for medical and indemnity benefits; whether commissioner's determination that plaintiff's claimed injuries were not a substantial factor in medical conditions and need for surgery was supported by evidence and was not inconsistent with law; whether board properly affirmed commissioner's denial of motion to correct findings, where findings were supported by evidence and included all material facts as determined by commissioner; whether board abused its discretion in denying motion to submit additional evidence to board; whether board reasonably could have concluded that plaintiff did not demonstrate that plaintiff had good reason for not presenting additional evidence to commissioner, where documents were in existence approximately four years before formal hearing on workers' compensation claim commenced.
- Merk-Gould v. Gould, 184 CA 512. 58A
Dissolution of marriage; whether trial court's finding that defendant had annual earning capacity of \$200,000 was clearly erroneous; claim that trial court abused its discretion in valuing defendant's interests in certain private equity companies on basis of cost of assets at time of purchase rather than as of date of marital dissolution; whether evidence supported finding that \$200,000 was net amount that defendant could realistically be expected to earn after being left with only 40 percent of investment assets after trial court awarded 60 percent to plaintiff; claim that trial court's order was precise means of providing remedy for defendant's dissipation of marital assets; failure to raise claim before trial court; whether trial court's alimony award was necessarily interwoven with court's remaining financial and property orders.
- State v. Carney, 184 CA 456 2A
Murder; motion to correct illegal sentence; whether trial court properly construed applicable statutes (§§ 17a-566 and 17a-567) and declined to hold that receipt of information from personnel at Whiting Forensic Division regarding recommendations for defendant's psychiatric treatment required sentencing court to consider more lenient sentence than that agreed on in plea agreement; claim that sentencing court relied on inaccurate information in sentencing defendant.
- State v. Durdek, 184 CA 492 38A
Murder; burglary in first degree; sexual assault in first degree; arson in first degree; tampering with physical evidence; claim that trial court improperly restricted defendant's cross-examination of state's witness by preventing defendant, for purposes of impeachment, from asking witness about misconduct that witness allegedly had committed as juvenile; whether defendant had provided adequate record to review claim when defendant failed to make offer of proof regarding how witness would have responded to any question about alleged misconduct.
- Vaccaro v. D'Angelo, 184 CA 467 13A
Interpleader; interpleader action to determine rights of defendants to portion of funds from settlement resolving personal injury action; claim that trial court

(continued on next page)

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL

(ISSN 87500973)

Published by the State of Connecticut in accordance with the provisions of General Statutes § 51-216a.

Commission on Official Legal Publications
 Office of Production and Distribution
 111 Phoenix Avenue, Enfield, Connecticut 06082-4453
 Tel. (860) 741-3027, FAX (860) 745-2178
www.jud.ct.gov

RICHARD J. HEMENWAY, *Publications Director*Published Weekly – Available at <https://www.jud.ct.gov/lawjournal>

Syllabuses and Indices of court opinions by
 ERIC M. LEVINE, *Reporter of Judicial Decisions*
 Tel. (860) 757-2250

The deadline for material to be published in the Connecticut Law Journal is Wednesday at noon for publication on the Tuesday six days later. When a holiday falls within the six day period, the deadline will be noon on Tuesday.

<i>improperly determined that named defendant was entitled to portion of settlement funds because named defendant failed to comply with certain provision in his provider agreement, and because authorization form provided by named defendant was unenforceable; claim that named defendant's authorization form was illegal on face and contrary to public policy because form violated statute ([Rev. to 2011] § 20-7f [b]) that makes unfair billing practice for healthcare provider to request payment, other than co-payment or deductible, from enrollee for medical services covered under managed care plan and because form violated certain other statutory provisions ([Rev. to 2011] §§ 36a-573 and 42-150aa [b]); claim that once defendant had exhausted chiropractic benefit under health plan, § 2.03.12 (b) in provider agreement required named defendant to provide other defendant with acknowledgment form, listing all noncovered services, at each and every subsequent visit prior to treatment; reviewability of claim that authorization form violated certain statutory provisions ([Rev. to 2011] §§ 36a-573 and 42-150aa [b]); failure to brief claim adequately; claim that authorization form was illegal and against public policy because it violated § 20-7f (b).</i>	
Volume 184 Cumulative Table of Cases	111A
MISCELLANEOUS	
Notice of Inactive Status of Attorney and Appointment of Trustee.	1B
Notice of Suspension of Attorney	1B